DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 392 758 SP 036 496

TITLE	Teacher Education: Report from the Prichard Committee for Academic Excellence, Task Force on Improving Kentucky Schools.
INSTITUTION	Prichard Committee for Academic Excellence, Lexington, KY.
PUB DATE	Oct 95
NOTE	26p.
PUB TYPE	Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Community Involvement; Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Position Papers; *Preservice Teacher Education; State Departments of Education; *State Standards; *Teacher Certification; *Teacher Education Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*Kentucky; Kentucky Education Reform Act 1990

ABSTRACT

The Prichard Committee, a citizens volunteer organization in Kentucky, has studied the current state of teacher education in Kentucky and presents its final recommendations. Teacher education reform has been slow in Kentucky due to its low priority on campus, the lack of a champion to push the reform, and the difficulties of instigating the reform, in general, due to already established certification and teaching guidelines. This report suggests that the solution to the challenge of slow reform is to follow the 1993 Governor's Task Force on Teacher Preparation recommendations, with substantial modifications, in the directions begun by the Education Professional Standards Board. Recommendations are individually described, and a detailed rationale presented for each one. A complete copy of the Task Force recommendations report is appended, followed by a discussion of suggested modifications to these recommendations. (NAV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 392 758

Teacher Education

Report from The Prichard Committee for Academic Excellence, Task Force on Improving Kentucky Schools

October, 1995

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
R. Sutton
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

SP036496

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Teacher Education
Report from the Task Force on Improving Kentucky Schools

Background

The Prichard Committee has, since its earlier reports in 1981 and 1984, felt deeply that improving the quality of teacher preparation and professional development is an imperative for the Commonwealth. In that same period teacher preparation has also been of great national interest; a need virtually everyone also believes is a top priority. But progress across the nation has been slow, despite attention from national organizations like the Holmes Group and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

The need is particularly great in Kentucky. With historical educational deficiencies, Kentucky teachers should be even better prepared than the average so they can teach so many students who come to school from backgrounds that make learning difficult. Since 1990, with teachers expected to help students reach higher academic content standards and with the measurement of academic performance paramount, the demand for improvement has a new urgency. As in the nation, progress in Kentucky on teacher education reform has been slow for several reasons.

First, teacher education is not usually the top priority on campus. It is the exception not the rule when college or university presidents lead teacher education reform efforts. Reluctance to change among teacher educators is also high and, without mandates from campus leadership, colleges of education have few incentives to improve. Where there has been change it has come because leadership was pushing.

Second, solutions are difficult and the steps to achieve teacher education reform are

not clear. The difficulty is compounded by the fact that pre-service teachers learn to teach in all their college classes not education classes alone. In particular, responsibility for teaching prospective teachers the subject matters falls on faculty in the arts and sciences. Faculty in these subjects advanced not by teaching well but by contributing to knowledge growth in their disciplines. Since new teachers model teaching they experienced across the campus, there is a need for vastly improved teaching in all classes. Such change is far too slow to come. Ensuring quality teaching has not been a campus priority across the Commonwealth.

Third, the state certification process has historically been based on inputs--required courses--and not results. With this vacuum of clear expectations for quality and performance, colleges of education have no target to aim for or standards against which to measure their success. "Improve," they might say, "for what?" Likewise, requiring specific courses has created a cadre of college faculty with a vested interest in protecting their courses.

Fourth, vastly improved teacher education, being difficult, being the domain of entrenched tradition, and being a low campus priority, has not had a reform champion. Governors, legislators, superintendents, and commissioners have seen no political pay-off in this issue. If an issue is to be tackled someone must lead the charge, but no leader has blown the bugle for improved teaching. In 1993 Governor Jones appointed a high level task force on teacher education that made useful recommendations. But after a weak attempt at passing reform legislation failed, reform enthusiasm died quietly. This was highly unfortunate; the quality of teacher education is central to the quality of schools.

Recommendations

The Prichard Committee, as an organization of volunteer citizens, believes that Kentucky must move forward with a forceful program of teacher education improvement. The goal in Kentucky is to vastly improve the quality of education for all children. This simply cannot be done without teachers who meet the highest academic standards themselves.

We believe that the solutions are to be found in the recommendations of the 1993 Governor's Task Force on Teacher Preparation (Appendix A), with substantial modifications, in the directions begun by the Education Professional Standards Board, on some campuses (such as the University of Louisville) and in the vast teacher education reform literature published in recent years at the national level. There is no need to start from scratch, so we have not done so. Our recommendations follow.

I. We recommend *that the goals and recommendations in the Governor's Task Force, with modification, should be pursued aggressively by the Kentucky General Assembly and the Commissioner of Education. The General Assembly should charge the Professional Standards Board, and colleges and universities with clear responsibility for implementation, provide a timetable for implementation that clearly sets standards for what is to be accomplished and when it is to be accomplished. The top priority should be on new standards, based on beginning teacher performance, not course accumulation for licensing and certification. This direction should make it absolutely clear that colleges and universities and the Education Professional Standards Board are responsible for improving the quality of teaching in Kentucky. The goals to be achieved, those we find most important from the Governors Task Force Report, are:*

   1. "The preparation of teachers, administrators, and certified non-teaching personnel should be aligned with the goals and objectives of KERA."

   2. "High standards of performance should be expected of all educators at all levels."

   3. "Certification should be streamlined and should be

accessible from a variety of routes."

Rationale

The basic framework for substantially improving teacher preparation is contained in the task force report. The challenge is to find a way to implement its most important recommendations. This will require expertise and leadership.

We include specific recommendations for modifying task force recommendations in Appendix B. This is an extensive report with 22 recommendations. Some of these have oversimplified the issues and in general the difficulty of implementation has been underestimated. We also find that frequent references to "KERA practices" and "successful KERA schools" raise many questions and cause confusion. We have explained our concerns in detail in Appendix B and do not repeat them in this report.

We do however strongly agree with the thrust of the report's recommendations--to require that teachers master challenging performance standards and to see that higher education institutions emphasize and adequately fund teacher preparation.

The core approach we recommend, and recommended by the task force, is to require and evaluate entry level knowledge and skills for licensing. This approach should, by establishing expectations, enrich the preparation of teaching in both content and skills. Teachers need a broad range of skills, and these should all be addressed. These include content knowledge; general pedagogical knowledge, including principles and strategies for classroom organization and management; curriculum knowledge, including materials and programs; pedagogical content knowledge, an amalgam of content and pedagogy that is teachers' special form of professional understanding; knowledge of learners and their

characteristics; knowledge of educational contexts, including the characteristics of classrooms, schools, communities, and cultures; knowledge of educational ends, purposes, and values, and their philosophical and historical grounds. (Darling-Hammond, Wise and Klein A License to Teach, 1994, p. 35)

The purpose of improved licensing standards is to emphasize skills rather than hours in class. Linda Darling-Hammond, writes that

> the important attribute ... is that they [standards] are performance-based--that is, they describe what teachers should know, be like, and be able to do rather than listing courses that should be taken to achieve a license. This shift toward performance-based standard setting is in line with the approach to licensing taken in other professions and with the changes already occurring in a number of states. The approach should clarify what the criteria are for assessment and licensing . . . ultimately, performance-based licensing standards should enable states to permit greater innovation and diversity in how teacher education programs operate by assessing their outcomes rather than merely regulating their inputs or procedures. (Darling-Hammond, p.45)

One important strength of the approaches suggested by the task force is to encourage innovation at the campus level to help students reach the established standards, not prescribe a one-size-fits-all for each institution of higher learning. These approaches should include some of the promising practice, such as Professional Development Schools and the 5-year Bachelors/Masters program at the University of Louisville. The emphasis on skills and standards rather than course taking is also meant to encourage colleges and universities to either make their masters degree programs meaningful or eliminate them.

Shifting the certification requirements to mastery of challenging and appropriate performance standards can also move the state closer to insuring that practitioners have and can use the knowledge and skills they will need.

We are also encouraged by the task force emphasis on:

- Identifying what teachers and administrators should know and be able to do in light of Kentucky's education goals, and designing preparation programs with these K-12 goals in mind, can add coherence and focus to the preparation programs.

- Focusing on the current teaching practices used by college faculty, comparing them to what is known about "best" teaching and learning strategies, and encouraging movement toward these best practices that can strengthen undergraduate teaching. This could benefit all students, regardless of whether they are in professional training programs.

- Ensuring that colleges and universities make the necessary financial commitments to teacher education programs that they want to maintain. Teacher education nationwide is often under-funded even when the programs bring substantial revenue to the training institution. Requiring the college or university to provide adequate resources and then justify the hard choices that will accompany such allocation decisions will likely increase the level of commitment to professional training.

II. We recommend *that one year from now and each year thereafter progress by the Education Professional Standards Board toward the goals of improved teacher education be evaluated and the public be informed of progress. This reporting should be undertaken by an expert panel appointed by the Governor.*

Rationale If new standards are to be achieved progress toward them must be monitored. This review should include an evaluation of the Council on Higher Education's capacity to provide direction for teacher education.

III. We recommend *that the Kentucky General Assembly take steps to ensure that the compensation plan that was mandated in 1990 be produced as soon as possible. This plan should propose ways to connect teacher compensation to demonstrated professional skills.*

Rationale The basic premise inherent in Kentucky education reform is that highly qualified individuals need to be attracted into teaching and that the skills of the teaching workforce need to be greatly enhanced through training and professional development. Both goals are

influenced by financial compensation. Thus the legislature requested in 1990 that the Kentucky Department of Education prepare a plan for restructuring teacher compensation. In the absence of this plan, no progress has been made nor legislative action taken.

Analysis and research at the national level offers interesting new approaches to teacher compensation. Among these is the idea of "skills based" compensation. This concept is one the Prichard Committee believed had merit in its 1985 report. Changing the compensation system from one based on seniority to one based on skills deserves serious consideration. (See "New Ideas for Reinventing Teacher Compensation," Carolyn Kelley and Allen Odden.)

IV. We recommend *that the Education Professional Standards Board establish policies and practices that strongly encourage Kentucky teachers to be certified by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards with appropriate incentives, compensation for expenses, goals for number of teachers who should become certified, and timetable for implementation. The Professional Standards Board should also explore the feasibility, cost, and time needed to require National Board Certification as a prerequisite for Rank I certification.*

Rationale The National Board has established rigorous methods that encourage exemplary teacher preparation. These are a powerful way to encourage pursuit by teachers of professional development. Kentucky teachers should be encouraged to seek and be rewarded for this rigorous certification.

V. We recommend *that the Prichard Committee form a joint task force, in cooperation with the Kentucky Education Association and the Kentucky Association of School Administrators, to encourage a concentration on improving teacher preparation.*

Rationale Teachers and administrators need encouragement from their professional organizations to reach higher standards of achievement. The Kentucky Education Association

and the Kentucky Association of School Administrators, as the visible voices of public school teachers and administrators, are influential in setting priorities at the state level. Leadership from the Kentucky Education Association and Kentucky Association of School Administrators is required if teacher education is to be vastly improved.

VI. We recommend *that a biennial Award for Excellence in Teacher Preparation be presented by the Prichard Committee to the college or university that displays exemplary achievement in the preparation of teachers or for an exemplary program or innovation.*

Rationale Those with primary responsibility for the preparation of teachers have few incentives to change. Criteria for this award should be built by a national panel and based on the goals contained in this report. Those criteria should emphasize attention to the quality of teacher preparation across the entire campus not in the college or department of education alone.

Report of the Governor's Task Force on Teacher Preparation

December 13, 1993

Presented to

The Honorable Brereton C. Jones
Governor of Kentucky

and to

Members of the 1994 General Assembly

Governor's Task Force on Teacher Preparation

Juanita Britt
Education Professional Standards Board

Representative Freed Curd

Senator Ed Ford

Frank Hamilton, Superintendent
Johnson County Public Schools

Sherry Jelsma, Secretary
Arts, Education, and Humanities Cabinet
(Task Force Chair)

Senator David Karem

Representative Marshall Long

James M. Miller, Chairman
Council on Higher Education

Wade Mountz
State Board for Elementary and Secondary Education
(Task Force Vice-Chair)

Representative Kenny Rapier

Josephine Richardson
Prichard Committee

Penney Sanders, Director
Office of Education Accountability

Sara Sidebottom
Ft. Mitchell, Kentucky

Ex Officio

Thomas C. Boysen, Commissioner
Kentucky Department of Education

Gary S. Cox, Executive Director
Council on Higher Education

Roland Goddu, Executive Secretary
Education Professional Standards Board

Support Staff

Susan Leib
Council on Higher Education

Introduction

The implementation in 1990 of the Kentucky Education Reform Act (KERA) heralded new expectations for all students, schools, and school districts. Likewise, it brought about new expectations for the teachers, administrators, and certified non-teaching personnel who staff the schools. Recognizing the importance of providing appropriate KERA-related training for both practicing and prospective educators, Governor Brereton C. Jones, on July 13, 1993, established the Task Force on Teacher Preparation to:

> review current practices in preparing Kentucky teachers, review related national and international trends, and, with the assistance of expert educational consultants as the Task Force deems necessary, to develop policy recommendations which will promote and support a model of teacher preparation which is in keeping with the learning goals and outcomes delineated in KERA.

The Task Force held six meetings, the purposes of which were to identify goals and priority issues relative to preparatory programs, and to develop recommendations for change for submission to the Governor and the 1994 General Assembly. Frank Newman, Executive Director, Education Commission of the States (ECS), and Calvin Frazier, Consultant for ECS, served as discussion facilitators during several of the meetings. A public hearing on the Task Force's recommendations was held on November 4, 1993, and a synopsis of testimony received is included in Appendix A.

Task Force members took seriously their charge to be action-oriented in their deliberations regarding how best to ensure that public school personnel are well-equipped to address the myriad of new responsibilities inherent in KERA. To this end, many of the recommendations contained herein will necessitate revolutionary thinking about preparatory programs, about the institutions which offer them, and about the education profession in its entirety. The Task Force appreciated this opportunity for interaction and debate, and is hopeful that its work constitutes a foundation upon which to build a "world-class" education workforce for the 21st century.

Report of the Governor's Task Force on Teacher Preparation

December 13, 1993

GOAL 1: The preparation of teachers, administrators, and certified non-teaching personnel should be aligned with the goals and objectives of KERA.

PRIORITY ISSUE: PREPARATORY PROGRAMS

Background Information:

The current system of teacher/administrator/certified non-teaching personnel preparation requires colleges/universities and local school districts to establish training programs based on specific curricula regulated by the Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB). In addition, institutions must meet standards relative to faculty, students, resources, and collaboration with the public schools which are identical to those established by the National Council on Accreditation of Teacher Education. The credentials of all candidates for teacher/administrator/non-teaching personnel certification, even those from out-of-state, are reviewed against EPSB degree program outlines which designate required coursework.

The Task Force believes that persons graduating from colleges/universities with education degrees should bring into the schools the most current knowledge and "best practices" (i.e., practices that improve student performance) to promote the six learner goals established in KERA. To this end, teachers, administrators, and non-teaching personnel in Kentucky should be certified only when they successfully complete a formal assessment based on the performance outcomes established by the EPSB. Similarly, programs to prepare these individuals should have high standards for faculty and students; should ensure that instruction emphasizes interaction between the training institutions and the schools; and should view academic expertise as central to effective teaching.

Recommendation 1:

The EPSB shall work in consultation with the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE), the State Board for Elementary and Secondary Education (SBESE), the Council on Higher Education (CHE), the colleges/universities, and the local school districts to develop Experienced Teacher Outcomes, Education Administrator Outcomes, and Certified Non-teaching Personnel Outcomes, ensuring that these outcomes are modeled after the already approved and disseminated New Teacher Outcomes, that they distinguish between the new/provisional level of proficiency and the professional and mastery levels, and that they are disseminated to the higher education institutions and the schools by July 1994.

Recommendation 2:

By July 1994, the EPSB, in consultation with the SBESE and the CHE, shall establish criteria for the school-based clinical preparation of teachers, administrators, and certified non-teaching personnel. These criteria shall be based on the best practices nationwide. Successful KERA schools shall be the only training and research sites for clinical experiences.

Recommendation 3:

Beginning January 1, 1994, the EPSB, in consultation with the CHE, shall review all existing education preparation degree programs to determine which programs at each institution best serve the needs of KERA, the need for on-going improvement of professional practice in Kentucky, and the need to reduce critical shortages in areas identified annually by the EPSB (e.g., minority, special education, and technologically-proficient certified educators).

Recommendation 4:

By March 1, 1994, the SBESE shall report to the EPSB and CHE on the areas of expertise in which practicing teachers, administrators, and certified non-teaching personnel should gain increased proficiency (e.g., subject matter, technology, leadership) as evidenced via need surveys. The EPSB and CHE, in cooperation with the colleges/universities, shall ensure that these areas are adequately addressed in the curricula of preparatory programs, and shall monitor institutional and student performance in these programs.

PRIORITY ISSUE: HIGHER EDUCATION FUNDING

Background Information:

The current higher education funding approach, which was developed in 1982-83, is primarily enrollment-driven, is based on the concept of "common funding for common activities," and affords money only for current, not planned, activities. Support rates for education credit hours are among the lowest in the funding formula. Concurrently, the state's limited general fund revenue necessitates that recommended changes in the funding approach be effected using reallocation of existing university resources, rather than relying on a large infusion of new funds into higher education.

As evidenced in its policy documents, the CHE supports restructuring of higher education programs and activities designed to prepare school personnel and/or to assist local school districts. Likewise, it recognizes that implementation of these policies will result in the need for increased support for KERA-related activities at the state's public universities. The Task Force endorses the CHE's commitment to the following principles:

- Given that education reform is important to the state, and that the system of higher education has been and may continue to be constrained financially, institutions choosing to continue offering teacher preparation programs shall provide adequate financial support for these programs.

- The funding formula generates support in recognition of the basic expectations for operating programs to prepare school personnel. Changes in the structure of these programs as necessitated by KERA (especially the increased use of practicums, internships, and field-based experiences) shall be considered in the comprehensive funding approach review which follows the 1994 session of the General Assembly (as mandated by KRS 164.020[4]).

- A more detailed, in-depth evaluation of the appropriate level and type of support for education reform efforts shall be included in the next comprehensive formula review.

- Available technology (e.g., interactive video) shall be used to implement new teaching strategies.

Recommendation 5:

By January 1, 1994, each institution (public and private) shall clearly indicate its intent to continue or discontinue its teacher education program. A decision to continue this program shall be contingent upon the institution's designating teacher education as a program priority, with concomitant commitment of resources to adequately support the program. Procedures to assess the level of commitment of resources to teacher education programs shall be established by the EPSB, in cooperation with the CHE and the colleges/universities.

Recommendation 6:

The public higher education funding approach shall be revised following the 1994 session of the General Assembly to reflect the following:

- the refined mission of each institution, respective of each institution's role in and prioritization of teacher education programs;

- performance-based measurements (e.g., student assessment, job placements, and service to local school districts) developed by the CHE and used as the basis for funding universities;

- the policy objectives of the Governor's Task Force on Teacher Preparation, specifically as they relate to inclusion of the EPSB's performance outcomes and the interactive model of teacher training envisioned by KERA ;

- the encouragement of quality rather than quantity in the recruitment of students for teacher education programs; and

- the provision of incentives to universities to undertake state-funded KERA research projects.

Recommendation 7:

The 1994-96 CHE funding recommendation shall be based on policy objectives of the Governor's Task Force on Teacher Preparation rather than on the current funding approach.

GOAL II: High standards of performance should be expected of all educators at all levels.

PRIORITY ISSUE: ASSESSMENT OF TEACHERS, ADMINISTRATORS, AND CERTIFIED NON-TEACHING PERSONNEL

Background Information:

Currently, Kentucky requires the successful completion of the Kentucky Teacher Internship Program (KTIP) or the Kentucky Principal Internship Program (KPIP) before a regular teacher or principal certificate is issued. There also exist Principals Assessment Centers and Superintendents Training Program and Assessment Centers. Completion of training/assessment programs at these centers is required by statute, but is not tied to certification.

For new teacher candidates, the formal assessments required by the EPSB include:

a. a grade-point average (GPA) of 2.5 and an American College Testing (ACT) exam score of 21 prior to acceptance into teacher education at a college or university *[Note: The average ACT score in Kentucky is 20.]*; and

b. a bachelor's degree from an approved teacher education program, a 2.5 overall GPA, satisfactory completion of student teaching, and passing grades on the National Teacher's Exam (NTE) core battery and teaching specialty tests prior to acceptance into KTIP *[Note: The passing scores on the NTE correspond to approximately the 10th percentile on national norms.]*.

For new principal candidates, the formal assessments required by the EPSB include:

a. three years' teaching experience, a master's degree, passing scores on the NTE core and administration/supervision specialty test, and a passing grade (85 percent correct) on the Kentucky Administrators' Test *[Note: The passing scores on the NTE correspond to approximately the 10th percentile on national norms.]*; and

b. during the KPIP experience, three performance observations during the principal's first year, conducted by a three-member panel using an observational assessment instrument.

All superintendents are required to complete a training and assessment program operated by the KDE. Training must address core concepts of management, school-based decision making, Kentucky school law, Kentucky school finance, and curriculum and assessment. At the conclusion of the training, each superintendent must complete a written comprehensive examination based on the content of the training.

The Task Force believes that, relative to all professions (e.g., medicine, law, education), the state has the responsibility to ensure at least minimum proficiency via independent entry-level (i.e., provisional certification) assessments, and that, in education, such assessments also should be used in designating professional and mastery levels of performance. Preparatory programs should thus provide continual assessment of their students so as to inform them of progress towards success. Likewise, school districts should use on-going performance assessment as an integral component in tenure and promotion decisions.

The assessment of proficiency, whether for certification in teaching, administration, or non-teaching fields, should include a measurement of subject matter specialization and expertise, as well as acceptable performance in a KERA setting. To this end, the EPSB should establish challenging academic standards and authentic assessment tasks. Additionally, professional educators should demonstrate good moral character, and the EPSB should therefore continue to enforce the Code of Ethics for Professionals. Finally, higher education and school district training programs should provide developmental, life-long learning opportunities so that educators may maintain and improve their expertise and proficiencies.

The quality of the assessments used to measure the aforementioned aspects of the education profession are critical to the system's credibility. The Task Force therefore believes that the assessment system should be made accessible to and equitable for all; it should render results which are valid, reliable, and related to national norms; and it should be authentic to Kentucky KERA settings. To facilitate the on-going oversight and upgrading of this system, each candidate for certification should be required to pay an assessment fee.

Recommendation 8:

By January 1, 1996, the EPSB shall establish and operate, in cooperation with institutions of higher education, Kentucky Educator Certification Centers to measure the expertise and proficiency of those applying for entry-level (i.e., provisional) or advanced (i.e., professional or mastery level) certification as teachers, administrators, or non-teaching personnel. The EPSB shall define the expected performance outcomes and the assessments to measure these outcomes. The EPSB shall develop procedures to ensure that the assessments are valid, reliable, equitable, accessible to all, related to national norms, and authentic to Kentucky KERA settings.

Recommendation 9:

The EPSB, in consultation with the CHE and the colleges/universities, shall establish continuous assessment programs at both the undergraduate and graduate levels as based upon the EPSB-approved performance outcomes for new and experienced teachers, administrators, and certified non-teaching personnel. These assessments shall include demonstrated proficiency in KERA goals, on performance in the classroom setting, and in "best practices" of the profession.

Recommendation 10:

The SBESE shall report annually to the EPSB and CHE regarding the "best practices" in Kentucky schools and expected new developments. The EPSB, in cooperation with the CHE, the institutions of higher education, and the public schools, shall ensure that all preparatory programs are revised to support these practices. The EPSB shall ensure that performance assessment tasks required for certification accurately reflect these practices.

PRIORITY ISSUE: ASSESSMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION TEACHING STRATEGIES AND LEARNER OUTCOMES

Background Information:

Under current state statutes, all university personnel matters, including promotion and tenure policies, are the exclusive purview of the university governing boards. The CHE's current program approval authority also is contained in state statute, and relevant five-year review policies include requirements for reporting outcome measures for all existing programs. Annual accountability reports on the quality and effectiveness of higher education are prepared by the CHE and the universities. The first such reports are due December 1993.

The Task Force believes that the CHE and EPSB should be authorized to review the tenure and promotion policies of colleges/universities offering education preparatory programs, specifically with regard to the importance accorded quality teaching and service to the schools. Likewise, these institutions should ensure a campus-wide, comprehensive approach to promoting student-centered teaching and measuring learner outcomes, and should implement an on-going series of measurements which address students' academic and pedagogical proficiency.

Recommendation 11:

A university choosing to train teachers, administrators, and/or certified non-teaching personnel shall adopt KERA principles of good teaching and conduct performance evaluations of all university faculty. Since teacher education majors take many, if not most, of their courses outside the colleges of education, systemic changes in collegiate teaching shall be required. When redefining the standards for good university teaching practices, parallels shall be drawn to the dramatic changes in public school teaching resulting from KERA's implementation. The university shall, by July 1994, submit to the CHE assurances of KERA's application in teaching strategies across campus, or a transition plan to revamp teaching methods university-wide, and shall provide adequate professional development opportunities for faculty to make the adjustments in their teaching styles necessary to reflect the principles of KERA.

To reinforce the aforementioned changes in teaching and learning, the EPSB, in consultation with the CHE and SBESE, shall develop for statewide use by July 1996 a primarily performance-based assessment to determine the eligibility of college students and others to be admitted to teacher education programs.

Recommendation 12:

New standards of practice, developed collaboratively by the CHE and EPSB, shall be mandated to ensure that public universities (and their faculties) engaged in the training of educators comply with the expectations of KERA. The following standards shall establish the minimum conditions required of a university choosing to offer preparatory programs:

- visibly making teacher, administrator, and/or certified non-teaching personnel preparatory programs an institutional priority for programmatic as well as funding purposes;

- providing a campus-wide commitment to active modes of student-centered teaching for all programs, and formally documenting this commitment in the university's strategic plan, with compliance measured via the CHE's program review process;

- making institutional reviews of teaching quality a major component in the program review process;

- incorporating quality instruction and service to the schools as meaningful components of faculty promotion and tenure policies, to be considered on par with research;

- establishing for all programs minimum expectations for learner outcomes, with measurements developed as part of the campus-wide assessment program, and making these outcomes subject to CHE and EPSB review based on protocol developed jointly by the CHE and EPSB, in cooperation with the colleges/universities;

- measuring, at set intervals, student outcomes in relation to expected outcomes for each degree program, using the results in the continuous improvement of programs, and reporting results in the CHE and EPSB's program review and accountability processes; and

- including the best practicing public school teachers and administrators in collegiate training programs.

Recommendation 13:

University education programs that do not comply with the aforementioned criteria within a timeframe set by the EPSB in consultation with the CHE shall have their approval of these programs revoked by the CHE and EPSB. Revocation procedures shall be incorporated in the CHE and EPSB program approval and review policies.

Recommendation 14:

Programs to prepare teachers/administrators/certified non-teaching personnel as offered by private institutions shall be subject to similar criteria. If these institutions wish to continue their programs and be approved by the EPSB, they shall be required to submit to EPSB program reviews similar to those conducted for the public universities. Furthermore, they also shall demonstrate campus-wide commitment to active teaching and learning modes, including promotion and tenure policies that reward good teaching practices and service to the schools.

GOAL III: Certification should be streamlined and should be accessible from a variety of routes.

PRIORITY ISSUE: STREAMLINING CERTIFICATION

Background Information:

In Spring 1993, the EPSB approved the following four levels of teacher certification: birth to primary, primary through grade six, grade five through grade nine, and grade seven through grade twelve. The current system also differentiates among at least 156 certification categories, each specifying its own course requirements.

Colleges/universities develop individual training programs, basic and advanced, to meet certification requirements. These programs are approved by the EPSB on the basis of input criteria such as course offerings, field placements, standards for admission, number of library books, faculty qualifications, and resources.

The Task Force believes that the goals and objectives of KERA necessitate recognition of demonstrated expertise (i.e., outcomes) as equally valuable to courses taken (i.e., inputs). Thus, the performance and academic outcomes specified by the EPSB for new and experienced teachers, administrators, and certified non-teaching personnel should identify the state's expectations and should, in turn, provide direction for the training institutions. The certification system, itself based on these expected outcomes,

should drive the necessary transformation of preparatory programs' structure and content.

The Task Force also believes that KERA's implementation gives new emphasis to governance via local decision making. Flexibility in certification is therefore necessary in order to meet the needs of individual school instructional programs. The preparation of educators should become a joint effort between higher education and the schools, with colleges/universities choosing to offer only those preparatory programs for which they have adequate resources and personnel, and by which they can make the most significant contribution to the education reform movement in Kentucky.

Recommendation 15:

By June 1995, the EPSB shall have in place a streamlined, KERA-based certification system, birth through grade 12. The number of basic certificates shall be reduced to four (i.e., teacher, principal, superintendent, and certified non-teaching personnel), and the number of certificate categories shall be reduced by at least 75 percent. The EPSB, in cooperation with the SBESE and the CHE, shall specify the depth and breadth of subject matter expertise required to support the curriculum offered in the schools, and shall define the certificates required to support the instructional programs.

Recommendation 16:

The EPSB, in consultation with the CHE, shall work cooperatively with colleges and universities to specify those undergraduate and graduate training programs leading to certification which are of priority in support of KERA and which meet critical shortage needs statewide, with emphasis on the recruitment and retention of minority candidates. Each institution shall provide a plan and assume responsibility for phasing out those specialties for which it is not able to offer adequate support. The EPSB and CHE shall work cooperatively with the institutions to ensure that programs in all certification areas are available to and reasonably accessible geographically and/or technologically by persons throughout the state.

Recommendation 17:

The EPSB shall ensure that assessments conducted via the Kentucky Educator Certification Centers become the means by which candidates for certification are evaluated relative to subject matter expertise and performance outcome levels, and shall ensure that the assessment instruments allow for valid, reliable, and equitable demonstration of proficiency.

PRIORITY ISSUE: ALTERNATIVE CERTIFICATION

Background Information:

Current alternative certification programs in Kentucky are of limited impact because the existing statute and regulations for implementing them are very restrictive and prescriptive. Entry criteria are difficult to meet, especially by those who have discontinuous academic backgrounds, and the specificity of the curriculum follows traditional patterns of training.

The Task Force believes that implementation of KERA has made obsolete the defining of educator preparation in terms of specified sequences of coursework. Rather, of critical importance today is assessing each prospective educator's academic and pedagogical competencies, and then affording him/her the most effective and efficient avenue for reaching the proficiency necessitated by KERA. Certification for teachers, administrators, and non-teaching personnel, therefore, should be outcomes-based, and should recognize that expertise must not always be achieved via traditional modes of training and the earning of degrees.

Recommendation 18:

The EPSB, in consultation with the CHE and the SBESE, shall establish alternative certification programs aligned with the goals and objectives of KERA and designed to meet statewide needs.

GOAL IV: Certification and compensation should be tied to performance.

PRIORITY ISSUE: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Background Information:

Professional development for teachers, administrators, and certified non-teaching personnel presently is tied to locally developed plans, the focus of which is on what educators need to know in order to support local implementation of KERA. The Task Force believes that transforming the total educational system, birth through post-secondary, is the ultimate goal of KERA, and that the expertise and skills of the professional staff who serve in this system are essential to reaching this goal. Just as instruction should be developmentally appropriate for young people, so it also should be developmentally appropriate for adults, including those in education. In meeting the individual needs of teachers, administrators, and certified non-teaching personnel, training institutions should ensure that their professional development and advanced training offerings are consistent with best practices, are research-based, and reflect the goals and objectives of KERA. To meet Kentucky's current need for massive professional development and training, collaboration among colleges, universities, schools, and communities is critical.

Recommendation 19:

The SBESE, in consultation with local school districts, shall work to ensure that the New/Experienced Teacher Outcomes, the Education Administrator Outcomes, and the Certified Non-teaching Personnel Outcomes developed by the EPSB serve as the basis for individual professional development plans. Significant emphasis should be placed on long-term training experiences. The EPSB, in consultation with the CHE, the higher education institutions, and the local school districts, shall identify those colleges/universities at which professional development is a high priority, and these institutions shall design KERA-related, school-based, long-term collaborative training and research programs based on best practices and leading to advanced certification/degrees.

Recommendation 20:

The EPSB, in consultation with the CHE and the colleges/universities, shall work to ensure that the Experienced Teacher Outcomes, the Education Administrator Outcomes, and the Certified Non-teaching Personnel Outcomes developed by the EPSB are the standards for approval of advanced education certification (i.e., professional and mastery levels), administration certification, and degree programs at colleges and universities. By July 1994, the EPSB, in consultation with the CHE and the higher education institutions, shall identify those colleges/universities at which advanced educator/ administrator preparation is a high priority, and these institutions shall design KERA-related, school-based, long-term collaborative training and research programs based on best practices and leading to advanced certification and/or degrees. Also, the EPSB, in cooperation with the CHE and the colleges/universities, shall develop a policy for approval of advanced educator/administrator preparation programs which requires continuous assessment on the outcomes and on KERA expectations.

PRIORITY ISSUE: COMPENSATION

Background Information:

The Task Force believes that KERA, by its emphasis on performance-based outcomes, has rendered the current system of compensation obsolete. Subject matter expertise and performance of teachers, administrators, and certified non-teaching personnel should be assessed and documented, and should serve as the basis for continued employment and compensation decisions. Years of experience and additional college hours should be irrelevant to the decision-making process unless they serve to significantly enhance the educator's role in the classroom and in the school. Conversely, successful performance on expected teacher/administrator certified non-teaching personnel outcomes should be valued highly and rewarded as such.

Structuring compensation systems that are tied to expertise and performance outcomes requires trust in the assessment criteria. Developing assessments that are valid, reliable, equitable, and accessible by all is therefore critical. Agreement on the expected outcomes is only a first step. Assessments also should delineate levels of performance, with rewards based on achievement of same. Reaffirmation of certification should be granted to only those personnel who are "professionals," and significant salary differ-

entials should distinguish those who are at the mastery level. All continued employment and compensation decisions should be integrally related to the development and on-going revision of individual educator professional development plans.

Recommendation 21:

All interested constituent groups (e.g., Kentucky Education Association, Kentucky Association of School Administrators, Kentucky Association of School Superintendents, Parent-Teacher Association) should submit to the Governor, no later than July 1, 1994, their recommendations as to how best to address, on a scheduled basis, the need for reaffirmation of certification, said recommendations to be discussed in the interim in preparation for the 1996 General Assembly.

Recommendation 22:

Recognizing the SBESE's responsibility to develop a compensation plan, the SBESE is urged to: (1) tie compensation to performance, and (2) phase out the master's requirement.

ACTION NEEDED

In order to implement and accomplish the above recommendations, the Task Force suggests that the Governor recommend to the 1994 General Assembly that it enact a Kentucky Teacher Education Reform Act to:

- recognize the EPSB-approved New/Experienced Teacher Outcomes, the Education Administrator Outcomes, and the Certified Non-teaching Personnel Outcomes as the standards for certification and for approval of higher education and local school district preparation programs in Kentucky;

- designate an authority to determine an adequate number of clinical training and development sites in successful KERA schools distributed across the six Congressional districts, where professional development offerings for degree programs will be provided on-site by faculty assigned to these sites;

- designate an authority to establish KERA school-based clinical training and development councils to coordinate research projects by higher education and public school faculties, and to provide training programs in the schools for higher education personnel relative to KERA goals, objectives, and practices (These councils should work in cooperation with the school-based decision making councils.);

- designate forgiveness loan funds for students enrolled in degree programs in critical shortage areas in any Kentucky public or private college or university;

- require the EPSB to establish a KERA accountability index for training programs, as well as for clinical training and development sites, which addresses, at a minimum:
  - performance of graduates on initial assessments,
  - performance of graduates on internship assessments,
  - performance of graduates on advanced assessments,
  - number of graduates employed in critical shortage areas, and
  - number of minority graduates

  (This index should be used to monitor institutional and student performance for the purpose of program approval, and the EPSB should make this information available to the public.);

- require the EPSB, in consultation with the colleges/universities and the schools, to develop valid, reliable, equitable, and authentic performance-based educator assessments, and to include state and national expertise in the development process as necessary;

- establish Kentucky Educator Certification Centers, in conjunction with the institutions of higher education, for the purpose of testing all candidates for certification relative to their expertise and performance in accordance with the outcomes and assessment tasks approved by the EPSB;

- require the EPSB to set admission and performance standards at levels that systematically increase the quality of certified personnel over the next five years;

- establish a task force to define standards for continuous assessment in preservice, internship, and inservice programs, to be composed of representatives from the EPSB, the CHE, the SBESE, college/university training programs, and the public schools;

- enable the CHE and EPSB to review higher education tenure and promotion policies with regard to how quality teaching and service to the schools are rewarded (These policies should be applicable to all faculty in institutions offering education preparatory programs.);

- authorize four basic certificates (i.e., teacher, principal, superintendent, and certified non-teaching personnel), with specialization categories to be defined by the EPSB (Those who hold certificates at the time this act is enacted should be allowed to renew said certificates; those persons who have earned credit in an approved college/university program leading to certification should be allowed to complete said program within three years.);

- ensure adequate state and institutional funds for the preparation of professional educators, particularly for addressing areas of critical shortage, including minority teachers, administrators, and certified non-teaching personnel;

- supersede the existing alternative certification statute and stipulate:
  - that alternative certification programs be available statewide for teachers, administrators, and/or certified non-teaching personnel, and that they be accessible both to practicing educators and to those outside the profession,
  - that persons be admitted to alternative certification programs on the basis of at least an earned baccalaureate degree and expertise demonstrated via performance outcome measurements,
  - that persons enrolled in alternative certification programs may be employed by school districts under the supervision of certified personnel,
  - that a significant portion of each alternative certification program be conducted at established KERA clinical training and development sites,
  - that persons completing alternative certification programs be evaluated at the Kentucky Educator Certification Centers, and that they be expected to meet the same performance and expertise criteria as those completing more traditional preparatory programs,
  - that a plan be devised to encourage selected university involvement in alternative certification, that establishment of an alternative certification program be contingent upon submission of a proposal for EPSB approval, and that all alternative certification programs either be operated by college/universities or demonstrate significant involvement of higher education in their development and implementation, and
  - that only successful KERA schools/school districts be permitted to operate alternative certification programs; and
- recognize and provide significant salary increases for mastery-level educators in the public schools.

Appendix B

SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS IN THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE GOVERNOR'S TASK FORCE ON TEACHER PREPARATION*

The task force report covers a lot of territory and addresses key issues relevant to reconfiguring teacher and administrator education in Kentucky. It can become an influential document when developed into legislation and practices.

SUGGESTED CHANGES AND CAUTIONS

* It is important to insure that teachers trained in Kentucky are aware of the goals and objectives of KERA and capable of teaching youngsters in ways that enhance their opportunities to be successful on the KIRIS assessments. However, in fulfilling this goal, there is a danger that programs will become too narrowly focused. More particularly, there is the possibility that the KIRIS outcomes as tested, rather than KERA goals more broadly drawn, will drive teacher education. This would be a mistake.

> *Recommendation: Legislation that describes the charge to teacher education institutions should be explicit in describing broad KERA goals and in distinguishing them from KIRIS. Criteria for accrediting the preparation institutions, similarly, should reflect broad goals with respect to areas of knowledge and skill and the pedagogues that might be employed to accomplish them.*

* Recommendation 2 under Goal I in the report states that only "successful" KERA schools can be teacher and administrator training sites for clinical experiences. The intention is to place prospective teachers and administrators in settings where they will have good opportunities to learn. The assumption is that "successful" will be a proxy for such a setting.

Yet, the recommendation raises several questions. To begin with, what does "successful" mean in this context? Is it a school that has met its benchmark on KIRIS? Is it something else? If it is connected with KIRIS, it is possible that a school might be successful one year and unsuccessful the next.

What might that variation mean for a school's role as a training site and for the establishment of some professional training relationships and capacities at the site? (My concern here is about the potential for instability in clinical training sites and the enormous amount of work that would then be involved each year in developing new sites.)

Pursuing this line of questions a bit further, what if there is a terrific program or team of teachers in an otherwise "unsuccessful" school? What if a school, for example, has an

*Prepared for the Prichard Committee by Barbara Neufeld, Harvard University

outstanding special education component in an otherwise unsuccessful school? Would a prospective special education teacher be denied a clinical experience in the site? What if a school is moving forward with excellent leadership, but is not yet successful? Might that school be a good training site for future teachers and administrators?

> *Recommendation: The word "successful" needs definition, and it is important to define it in ways that do not exclude sites that are good for particular learning experiences. The process of developing the definition of successful might best be informed by a careful discussion of what it is that practitioners need to learn in their clinical experiences and what characteristics a training site needs to have to promote such learning. It may be useful, at the same time, to consider whether "successful" is the best word to use when describing potential clinical sites.*

* Goal II calls for the implementation of high standards of performance for educators at all levels. This could be extremely useful, but leads to several questions.

First, what ideas about teaching practices, and what assessment instruments will guide the development of the parameters and indicators of "high standards of performance" that will inform the work of the Kentucky Educator Certification Centers, for example. The concern here, again, is that broad KERA goals will be translated into too narrow a set of acceptable practices; that acceptable practices may be too tightly tied to beliefs about how to increase KIRIS scores rather than to ideas about education outcomes construed more broadly.

Second, the report's use of the term "best practices" adds to concern in this regard. Many of the current teaching strategies promoted in Kentucky and across the nation remain untested in large scale reform. We know that they are effective when used by teachers who find them compatible and whose subject matter knowledge is deep; we are less sure how to teach people to teach in these ways if they are not already doing so, and we do not yet know the extent of the practices' effectiveness across a wide range of children. We support the implementation of the teaching reforms, coupled with careful research; but, as Kentucky implements the current version of "best practices," it should adopt a cautionary, inquiring stance appropriate to the depth and breadth of the knowledge base guiding the implementation.

> *Recommendation: given the combination of very high hopes and expectations for new teaching practices coupled with the limited scope of knowledge and experience in using them, implementors of this report should avoid writing assessment criteria that a) overspecify acceptable teaching practices, and b) push the colleges and universities and the public schools toward adopting a "one best system" approach to pedagogy. Implementation should explicitly leave room for alternatives, and provide for evaluation that can inform further implementation.*

* The report correctly notes that college teachers of core academic subjects do not always teach with strategies encouraged by KERA. Too often, their pedagogy rests heavily on lectures, and does not encourage students' active participation in constructing their own

subject matter knowledge. (The same can often be said, unfortunately, about those who teach the teacher education courses.) The merit of traditional college teaching is increasingly under question, but traditions of autonomy with respect to teaching are deeply in-grained at the post-secondary level. Therefore, although I strongly agree with the recommendations for changes in college teaching in academic areas so that prospective teachers a) come to deeply know their subject matter, and b) experience it taught in ways they might well adopt for use K-12, the report's recommendation should not be implemented as written even though the goal is commendable.

Fundamentally, the report does not reflect sufficient awareness of a) the massive staff development effort that would be required for this enterprise; b) the absence of trained personnel who could provide the staff development if the requisite, extensive resources were available; and c) the potential for teacher education to be held hostage by faculty in the arts and sciences who may not be primarily invested in the preparation of teachers, and who, therefore, have little incentive to change their ways of teaching to facilitate program accreditation.

Recommendation: Begin the effort to change college teaching by involving, first, those faculty members who want to improve/change/diversify their teaching repertoire. This might involve the colleges in providing some kind of minimal incentive system for participation. Such incentives might be considered as one indicator of the institution's commitment to teacher preparation. Second, continue the effort in the process of recruiting new faculty. Colleges, as part of the faculty search process, might include specific criteria that relate to teaching (and go beyond the teaching evaluations collected from the candidate's current institution). Third, when new faculty join the college, the college might include professional development with respect to teaching, as part of its on-going effort to support the newcomer. In this way, some long-standing faculty members might become involved in improving their teaching; the institution would be giving an explicit message about its teaching priorities by investing in new faculty; and the overall effect could be a change in the culture of teaching in the college and an improvement in learning.